DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 101 TM 005 812

AUTHOR Iwanicki, Edward F.
TITLE An Evaluation of the 1975-76 Hartford Project Concern Program.
INSTITUTION Capitol Region Education Council, Bloomfield, Conn.
SPONS AGENCY Connecticut State Dept. of Education, Hartford.
PUB DATE Aug 76
NOTE 103p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Affective Behavior; *Bus Transportation; Cognitive Measurement; *Compensatory Education Programs; Educational Opportunities; Elementary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Parent Attitudes; *Program Attitudes; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Reading Achievement; Reading Tests; Student Attitudes; Suburban Youth; Teacher Attitudes; Urban Youth
IDENTIFIERS Connecticut (Hartford); *Hartford Project Concern Program; Voluntary Busing; Woodcock Reading Mastery Test

ABSTRACT

The 1975-76 Hartford Project Concern Program marks the end of a decade in which Hartford and suburban communities have participated in a voluntary busing program aimed at enriching the educational opportunities of both urban and suburban youth. In May 1976, the Capitol Region Education Council received a grant from the Connecticut State Department of Education to implement a design for the evaluation of the 1975-76 Hartford Project Concern Program. Due to budgetary and time constraints, it was decided to focus upon two crucial areas, the cognitive and affective impact of Project Concern on program participants. A basic decision was made to evaluate student cognitive growth using a standardized commercially available reading test. It was further decided that the affective impact of Project Concern would be evaluated through a survey of the attitudes of students, suburban teachers, and suburban parents using questionnaires. (Author/MV)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED131101

PROJECT CONCERN

1975-1976 EVALUATION REPORT

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Prepared by:

Edward F. Iwanicki
University of Connecticut

Prepared for:

Capitol Region Education Council
Bloomfield, Connecticut

TM005 812

AN EVALUATION

OF THE

1975-76 HARTFORD PROJECT CONCERN PROGRAM

Conducted by

Edward F. Iwanicki
University of Connecticut

For the

Capitol Region Education Council
Bloomfield, Connecticut

August, 1976

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This evaluation of the 1975-76 Hartford Project Concern Program would not have been possible without the full cooperation of the participating communities. My sincere thanks are extended to the superintendents, principals, and teachers in the Project Concern communities for their support and assistance. Never was a request for help met with resistance.

In addition, I wish to express my gratitude to particular individuals whose efforts were crucial to the conduct of this evaluation:

To Wallace Roby of the Connecticut State Department of Education for his support and interest that a quality program evaluation be conducted consistent with the desires of the Concern communities.

To John J. Allison, Jr., and Philip Saif of the Capitol Region Education Council for their efficiency in administering the grant supporting this evaluation as well as their efforts at communicating with Concern communities in matters crucial to the conduct of this evaluation.

To Charles Clock of the West Hartford Public Schools for his assistance in the planning of this evaluation and his willingness to analyze the data collected.

To Robert Nearine, William Paradis, and Peter Quinn of the Hartford Public Schools for their inputs into the design of the cognitive testing procedures, their assistance in identifying the Hartford evaluation sample, and their cooperation in providing access to information regarding Project Concern participants.

To Hartford Test Specialists for the professional manner in which they conducted the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test pre- and posttest activities.

To Robert Hopkins and Deborah Formica for their assistance in checking and processing the evaluction data collected.

To Carol Fortier and Claire Messier for their secretarial assistance, often in light of some tight time constraints.

Finally, this section would not be complete without a sincere thank you to the many students and parents who participated in this evaluation.

It is hoped that all who participated in this evaluation effort will affect decisions having positive impact on the future operation of the Hartford Project Concern Program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		ii
LIST OF TABLES		vi
CHAPTER		
I	INTRODUCTION AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	1
	Introduction	1
	Development of the Evaluation Design	2
	Research Design Considerations	6
	Sampling Considerations	6
	Instrumentation	15
	Treatment of the Evaluative Data	18
II	ASSESSMENT OF THE COGNITIVE IMPACT OF PROJECT CONCERN AS MEASURED BY THE WOODCOCK READING MASTERY TEST	20
	Reading Growth of Project Concern Students	20
	Reading Growth of Project Concern Students Compared to the Growth of Suburban Classroom Peers and the Hartford Evaluation Sample	23
	Limitations and Cautions in Reviewing the Results Presented	31
III	SUBURBAN TEACHER VIEWS OF THE PROJECT CONCERN PROGRAM	34
	Background Information	34
	Suburban Teacher Ratings of Concern Pupil Progress	36
	Suburban Teacher Views of the Influence of Project Concern Children on Suburban Children	38
	Suburban Teacher Views Regarding the Continuation of Project Concern	39
	Suburban Teacher Views of Areas Where the Project Concern Program can be Improved	43
	A Cautionary Note on the Use of the Results Presented	45

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

CHAPTER		Page
IV	STUDENT VIEWS AS THEY RELATE TO THE PROJECT CONCERN PROGRAM	47
	Views of Project Concern Students	47
	Suburban Peers Views of Concern Participants	51
	Hartford Student Views of the Project Concern Program	53
	View of Concern, Suburban, and Hartford Students Toward School Life	53
	A Cautionary Note on the Use of the Student Survey Results	61
V	SUBURBAN PARENT VIEWS OF THE PROJECT CONCERN PROGRAM	65
	Suburban Parent Perceptions of Project Concern	65
	Suburban Parent Views of the Personal Relationships Between Suburban and Project Concern Children	68
	Suburban Parent Views Regarding the Continuation of Project Concern	70
	Limitations of the Reported Perceptions of Suburban Parents Toward Project Concern	72
VI	SUMMARY	73
APPENDIX		
	Concern Pupil Interview Form	A-1
	Suburban Peer Interview Form	A-4
	Hartford Student Interview Form	A-6
	Suburban Teacher Questionnaire	A-8
	Suburban Parent Questionnaire	A-13

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1	Relationship Between the Research Design Utilized to Examine the Impact of Project Concern on Reading Achievement and the Questions Posed by Participating Communities. . .	7
2	Summary by Community of the Total Number of Students Participating in Project Concern and the Number Comprising the Evaluation Sample . . .	9
3	Summary by Community of the Total Number of Classrooms and Suburban Peers Comprising the Evaluation Sample	10
4	Summary by School and Grade Level of the Total Number of Students Comprising the Hartford Evaluation Sample.	13
5	Evaluation Sample Attrition Summarized by Grade Levels and Groups Studied	14
6	Summary of Woodcock Reading Mastery Test Mastery and (Grade Equivalent) Mean Score Results by Grade Level for the Project Concern Sample.	21
7	Summary of Woodcock Reading Mastery Test Mastery and (Grade Equivalent) Mean Score Results by Grade Level for the Suburban Classroom Peer Sample	25
8	Summary of Woodcock Reading Mastery Test Mastery and (Grade Equivalent) Mean Score Results by Grade Level for the Hartford Student Sample.	26
9	Summary of Woodcock Reading Mastery Test Mastery and (Grade Equivalent) Mean Score Results for Grades 2, 4 and 6 Combined for each of the Samples Studied	27

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

TABLE		Page
10	Comparison of the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test Growth of Project Concern Participants to the Growth of Suburban Classroom Peers and the Growth of the Hartford Sample Using the Hotelling T^2 Technique	30
11	Background Characteristics for Staff Responding to the Suburban Teacher Questionnaire.	35
12	Summary by Grade Level of Suburban Teacher Ratings of the Progress of Project Concern Participants	37
13	Responses by Grade Level for Student Survey Items Unique to Project Concern Students	48
14	Responses by Grade Level for Student Survey Items Unique to Suburban Peers as well as those Survey Items Unique to Hartford Peers. . .	52
15	Summary of Student Survey Responses to the Following Item for Concern, Hartford, and Suburban Students. Item: How do you Like Going to (name) School?.	54
16	Summary of Student Survey Responses to the Following Item for Concern, Hartford, and Suburban Students. Item: Compared to Other Students in your Class, How Hard do you Work at School?.	56
17	Summary of Student Survey Responses to the Following Item for Concern, Hartford, and Suburban Students. Item: Compared to Other Students in your Class, How Good is your Schoolwork?	57
18	Summary of Student Survey Responses to the Following Item for Concern, Hartford, and Suburban Students. Item: How Often do the Children in your Class Help Each Other With their Classwork?	59

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

TABLE		Page
19	Summary of Student Survey Responses to the Following Item for Concern, Hartford, and Suburban Students. Item: How Often do the Children in your Class Help you with your Classwork?	60
20	Summary of Student Survey Responses to the Following Item for Concern, Hartford, and Suburban Students. Item: How Often are the Children in your Class Friendly to Each Other? .	62
21	Summary of Student Survey Responses to the Following Item for Concern, Hartford, and Suburban Students. Item: How Often are the Children in your Class Friendly to you?	63

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The 1975-76 Hartford Project Concern Program marks the end of a decade in which Hartford and suburban communities have participated in a voluntary busing program aimed at enriching the educational opportunities of both urban and suburban youth. During this ten year period, the participation of suburban communities has been expanded from five to fourteen towns. Also, public school enrollment in this program has grown from about 300 pupils at grades K-5 to close to 1000 pupils at grades K-12. The future of Project Concern looks equally promising as evidenced by continued and expanded support of the program by the Connecticut State Department of Education. In addition, Hartford and the suburban communities have agreed to increase the public school student enrollment in Project Concern by approximately 10% during the 1976-77 school year.

As the Project Concern program has expanded, so have the inquiries regarding its effectiveness. More specifically, school boards, educators, and citizens in participating communities have been asking whether Project Concern is successful from an educational standpoint. The difficulty in answering this question lies in defining the term "successful." Some accept the ability of students of differing races to interact effectively as evidence of the success of Project Concern. Others seek

measures of cognitive and affective test growth as evidence of program success. In May 1976, the Capitol Region Education Council received a grant from the Connecticut State Department of Education to address such issues through the development and implementation of a design for the evaluation of the 1975-76 Hartford Project Concern Program.

Development of the Evaluation Design

Upon receiving the grant for the evaluation of Project Concern, the Capitol Region Education Council established a steering committee. The role of this committee was to select and work with an evaluation consultant on the development of a design for the Evaluation of Project Concern consistent with the needs of the participating communities. The membership of this committee was as follows:

1. Representing the Capitol Region Education Council

   John J. Allison, Jr.
   Executive Director
   Philip Saif
   Director of Evaluation

2. Representing the Connecticut State Department of Education

   Wallace Roby
   Title I Program Specialist

3. Representing the Hartford Public Schools

   John Alschuler
   Special Assistant
   Hartford Board of Education

   Robert Nearine
   Administrator for Funding and Evaluation

   William F. Paradis
   Supervisor, Project Concern

4. Representing the Suburban School Districts

Robert Goldman
Superintendent
South Windsor Public Schools

As work commenced on the development of the design for the evaluation of Project Concern, it was evident that many aspects of the program could be evaluated. Due to budgetary and time constraints, it was decided to focus upon two crucial areas, the cognitive and affective impact of Project Concern on program participants.

The steering committee met with its evaluation consultant on several occasions from May to September, 1975, to react to alternative methods for evaluating the cognitive and affective impact of Project Concern. The design options for evaluating the cognitive effects of the program evolved smoothly. A basic decision was made to evaluate student cognitive growth using a standardized commercially available reading test. The potential of using various research designs and standardized tests in this assessment of reading growth was explored systematically and appropriate alternatives were identified.

Efforts to develop a design for the evaluation of the affective impact of Project Concern were less fruitful. Initially, a decision was made to explore the possibility of assessing the affective impact of the program in the areas of attitude toward school, self-concept, and social relations. The major problem arose when an attempt was made to identify techniques for measuring student behavior in these areas. Serious doubt was cast upon the validity or accuracy of available techniques for the

assessment of affective student behavior. The basic argument presented was that each of the techniques reviewed for the assessment of affective student behavior were inherently culturally biased and would not provide quality information for policy decision-making. At the recommendation of the steering committee, a consultant with expertise in the culture fair assessment of student affective behavior was contacted to review and modify the affective instruments under consideration with the intent of minimizing the validity and inherent culture bias problems identified. Dr. Dalton Jones of the Department of Child Psychology at the University of Massachusetts assumed this responsibility.

At the conclusion of the summer, the potential alternatives for evaluating the cognitive and affective impact of Project Concern were delineated by the evaluation consultant and steering committee. Two meetings were held in September and October 1976, where these evaluation alternatives were presented to superintendents and board of education chairpersons from communities participating in Project Concern. After considerable discussion of the various alternatives, a decision was made regarding the cognitive component of the evaluation as follows:

> The evaluation will seek to answer the following major question:
>
> > What Woodcock Reading Mastery Test growth have Project Concern students in the suburbs exhibited?
>
> with two subsections:
>
> > Does the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test growth of Project Concern students in

the suburbs differ from the growth of those students who have remained in Hartford?

Does the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test growth of Project Concern students in the suburbs differ from the growth of their suburban classroom peers?

(From CREC Memo of October 24, 1975.)

Regarding the affective component of the evaluation, a decision was made not to use the affective assessment techniques identified and further developed during the design phase of the evaluation. Superintendents and board of education chairpersons reaffirmed the position of the steering committee that the instruments under consideration would not provide adequate information for policy decision-making. It was further decided that the affective impact of Project Concern would be evaluated through a survey of the attitudes of students, suburban teachers, and suburban parents using modified versions of the questionnaires developed by Dr. Thomas W. Mahan in an earlier evaluation of Project Concern (Mahan, 1968). A task force was appointed to work with the project evaluator on the modification of the Mahan instruments. Membership on this task force was as follows:

1. Philip Saif
   Capitol Region Education Council

2. Wallace Roby
   Connecticut State Department of Education

3. Richard Lakin
   Glastonbury Public Schools

4. John Alschuler
   Robert Nearine
   Peter Quinn
   Hartford Public Schools

5. Charles Clock
West Hartford Public Schools

Research Design Considerations

In order to adequately address the questions posed by the participating communities about the impact of Project Concern on reading growth, it was necessary to focus on the following student groups:

1. Project Concern Participants - those Hartford students attending public schools in the suburbs through the Project Concern Program.

2. Suburban Classroom Peers - those suburban students being instructed in the same classrooms as the Project Concern participants.

3. Hartford Students - those students being instructed in Hartford who meet the eligibility criteria for participation in Project Concern.

Given these three student groups, reading growth was assessed using a basic pretest-posttest research design. A random sample of students from each group at grades 2, 4 and 6 was administered the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test in the winter and again during the spring of the 1975-76 school year. Then pretest to posttest reading growth was calculated and assessed in light of the questions being asked by Concern communities. The relationship between the research design utilized and the decision-making information provided to answer the questions posed by participating communities is summarized in Table 1.

Sampling Considerations

In order to be sure that the reading growth of Project

TABLE 1

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE RESEARCH DESIGN UTILIZED TO EXAMINE THE IMPACT OF PROJECT CONCERN ON READING ACHIEVEMENT AND THE QUESTIONS POSED BY PARTICIPATING COMMUNITIES

I. Groups Studied	II. Woodcock Reading Mastery Test Data Collected		
	Pretest Results	Posttest Results	Test Growth
Project Concern	PC_1	PC_2	$PC_2-PC_1=GPC$
Suburban Peers	SP_1	SP_2	$SP_2-SP_1=GSP$
Hartford Students	HS_1	HS_2	$HS_2-HS_1=GHS$

III. Questions Posed	IV. Decision-Making Information Provided
What Woodcock Reading Mastery Test growth have Project Concern students in the suburbs exhibited?	GPC
Does the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test growth of Project Concern students in the suburbs differ from the growth of the students who have remained in Hartford?	GPC GHS
Does the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test growth of Project Concern students in the suburbs differ from the growth of their suburban classroom peers?	GPC GSP

Concern students was representative of the students participating in the program a random sample of 80 students was selected at grades 2, 4 and 6. These students were selected from the total population of public school students participating in the suburban Project Concern program as of November 1, 1976. A summary by community of the number of students in Project Concern as well as the number randomly selected for participation in the evaluation is presented in Table 2.

In assessing suburban classroom peer growth, it was also important for this growth to be representative of the reading growth of the Concern child's suburban classroom peers. This created some problems since in most situations only one or two Project Concern children were in a class of approximately twenty students. Although the best estimate of peer growth could be obtained by testing all eighteen peers, this option was neither practically nor financially feasible. Upon considering various alternatives, it was decided that an adequate estimate of suburban peer growth would be obtained by sampling at random four classroom peers from each classroom where a Project Concern child comprising the evaluation sample resided. A summary by community of the total number of classrooms and suburban peers comprising the evaluation sample at grades 2, 4 and 6 is presented in Table 3.

In the selection of the Hartford student evaluation sample, every effort was made to select students similar to those participating in the Project Concern Program. The process for selecting participants for Project Concern is as follows:

TABLE 2

SUMMARY BY COMMUNITY OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN PROJECT CONCERN AND THE NUMBER COMPRISING THE EVALUATION SAMPLE

Community	Grade 2		Grade 4		Grade 6		Total	
	# Concern	# Sampled	# Concern	# Sampled	# Concern	# Sampled	# Concern	# Sampled
Avon					2	2	2	2
Canton	10	10	10	9	4	3	24	22
E. Hartford					6	5	6	5
Farmington	18	15	17	12	9	6	44	33
Glastonbury	12	10	12	10	3	3	27	23
Granby			4	4			4	4
Manchester	12	11	2	2	6	6	20	19
Newington			6	6	6	5	12	11
Plainville	2	1	1		4	4	7	5
Simsbury	1	1	4	3	6	4	11	8
S. Windsor	9	6	4	3	2	1	15	10
W. Hartford	30	26	35	30	43	34	108	90
Wethersfield			1	1	8	7	9	8
Totals	94	80	96	80	99	80	289	240

TABLE 3

SUMMARY BY COMMUNITY OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF CLASSROOMS AND SUBURBAN PEERS COMPRISING THE EVALUATION SAMPLE

Community	Grade 2		Grade 4		Grade 6		Total	
	# Classrooms	# Peers	# Classrooms	# Peers	# Classrooms	# Peers	# Classrooms	# Peers
Avon	5	20	5	20	1	4	1	4
Canton					3	12	13	52
E. Hartford	9	36	9	36	2	8	2	8
Farmington	5	20	7	28	5	20	23	92
Glastonbury			2	8	2	8	14	56
Granby	7	28	2	8			2	8
Manchester			5	20	5	20	14	56
Newington	1	4			3	12	8	32
Plainville	1	4	3	12	4	16	5	20
Simsbury	5	20	3	12	4	16	8	32
S. Windsor	19	76	20	80	1	4	9	36
W. Hartford			1	4	17	68	56	224
Wethersfield					6	24	7	28
Totals	52	208	57	228	53	212	162	648

1. A sample of students eligible for the program at each grade level is selected randomly by pulling every fifth student record from the files at Hartford Title I schools.

2. This sample is then screened to eliminate from consideration all students who have a tested IQ of 80 or less or who have been recommended for or have been placed in a special class such as IIC, EMR, etc. If the IQ is questionable, and the student has been referred for additional testing, the youngster should also be excluded from consideration. Finally, all youngsters are excluded who have 40 or more days of absence during the last school year for which a record is available.

3. Next, a final pool of students eligible for participation in Project Concern is created by asking the parents of children in the screened sample if they want their child to participate in the program.

4. As openings in the Project Concern program become available, new participants are selected at random from the pool of eligible students.

This same process was adhered to in the selection of the Hartford student evaluation sample participating in this evaluation of Project Concern. The Hartford student evaluation sample is similar to the Project Concern evaluation sample to the extent that both groups were selected from similar eligible attendance areas (i.e., Title I school districts) using the same modified random selection criteria. Although an attempt was made to identify a Hartford student sample of 80 students at grades 2, 4 and 6, this was possible only at grades 2 and 6. At grade 4 a smaller evaluation sample was identified due to two problems. First, it was more difficult to contact the parents of fourth grade students to find out whether they would be willing to allow their children to participate in Project Concern

if an opening was available. Secondly, parents of fourth grade students tended to be more reluctant to allow their children to participate in Project Concern. The number of students comprising Hartford evaluation sample is summarized by school and grade level in Table 4.

It is important to note that for the most part the Project Concern, suburban, and Hartford students selected for participation in the evaluation of Project Concern according to the procedures described did participate. There were two basic conditions under which an identified student was excluded from the evaluation -- 1) the student left the school district, or 2) the student could not be administered the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test. It was decided that students meeting any one of the following criteria could not be administered the Woodcock:

1. Children who have physical disabilities or impairments which would make the Woodcock results invalid (i.e., deafness, blindness, speech impediments),

2. Children who are emotionally disturbed and would be psychologically damaged by a testing situation,

3. Children whose parents have definitely specified that their child should not be tested individually under any circumstances.

In situations where an identified student could not participate in the evaluation, another child was selected to take that student's place using appropriate sampling procedures. Due to the favorable cooperation of school district personnel in the communities involved in Project Concern, less than 2% of the original sample was excluded from participation in the evaluation.

TABLE 4

SUMMARY BY SCHOOL AND GRADE LEVEL
OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPRISING
THE HARTFORD EVALUATION SAMPLE

School	Grade 2	Grade 4	Grade 6	Total
Arsenal	19	14	15	48
Jones	42	23	33	98
Vine	12	4		16
Waverly	6	16	25	47
Wish	3	3	10	16
Total	82	60	83	225

A problem which can create some difficulty in the evaluation of a program such as Project Concern is sample attrition. Sample attrition is a situation where students who have been pretested are no longer available for post-testing. Attrition for the samples identified in this evaluation of Project Concern is summarized by grade level and groups studied in Table 5. From an examination of Table 5, it is evident that attrition was not a problem in this evaluation of Project Concern. For the most part sample attrition did not exceed 10%.

To be sure that sample attrition did not have an effect on pre-post test comparisons, the mean pretest scores of students who dropped out of the evaluation sample were calculated and compared to the mean pretest results for students who remained in the evaluation sample. Generally, there was no observable difference between the pretest means for students who

TABLE 5

EVALUATION SAMPLE ATTRITION SUMMARIZED BY GRADE LEVELS AND GROUPS STUDIED

Groups Studied	Grade 2 Original Sample Size	Grade 2 Sample Attrition N	Grade 2 Sample Attrition %	Grade 4 Original Sample Size	Grade 4 Sample Attrition N	Grade 4 Sample Attrition %	Grade 6 Original Sample Size	Grade 6 Sample Attrition N	Grade 6 Sample Attrition %	Total Original Sample Size	Total Sample Attrition N	Total Sample Attrition %
Project Concern Participants	80	6	7.5%	80	10	12.5%	80	3	3.75%	240	19	7.92%
Suburban Classroom Peers	208	3	1.44%	228	7	3.17%	212	6	2.83%	648	16	2.47%
Hartford Students	82	4	4.88%	60	3	5.00%	83	1	1.20%	225	8	3.56%
Totals	370	13	3.51%	368	20	5.43%	375	10	2.67%	1113	43	3.86%

remained in the evaluation sample versus those who dropped out. This indicates that sample attrition does not have significant bearing on interpreting the reading growth of each sample examined in this evaluation of Project Concern.

Instrumentation

The basic instrument used to assess reading growth was the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test. The Woodcock Reading Mastery Test is an individually administered evaluation instrument which yields scores in the following skill areas:

1. Letter identification
2. Word identification
3. Word attack
4. Word comprehension
5. Passage comprehension
6. Total reading

The Woodcock was administered on a pre-test (Form A) and post-test (Form B) basis to all students comprising the evaluation sample by Hartford Test Specialists. Although serious efforts were made to pre-test all students during the same month, this was not possible. The pre-test schedule generally emerged as follows:

1. Project Concern participants - December 1975
2. Suburban classroom peers - January 1976
3. Hartford students - February 1976

Several factors mediated against pre-testing the suburban classroom peers and the Hartford students at the same time as the Project Concern participants. In the suburbs, the major problem which delayed the pre-testing of suburban peers was the need to gain parental permission to test students in some communities.

In Hartford, pretesting was delayed due to difficulties encountered in contacting the parents of the prospective Hartford evaluation sample to ask if they would be willing to allow their child to participate in Project Concern if the opportunity was available. When first attempting to contact Hartford parents it was found that 84% of the parents did not have telephones. When attempting to make personal contact with these parents, case workers found that 32% of the parents had moved and 10% were not home. Most of these parents were contacted eventually through the guidance and efforts of school-based social workers.

All students participating in the Project Concern Evaluation were post-tested in May 1976.

During pre- and post-testing, the Hartford Test Specialists recorded instances where students exhibited a level of distraction or anxiety which they thought cast doubt upon the accuracy of the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test results obtained. The occurrence of such testing problems was minimal across the three groups studied and ranged from an average of 4.3% at grade 2 to 3.2% at grade 6.

Student, suburban teacher, and suburban parent attitudes toward Project Concern were assessed using a series of survey instruments developed by the program evaluator in cooperation with the task force appointed by superintendents and board of education chairpersons from communities participating in Project Concern. Sample copies of these instruments are presented in the Appendix of this report. It is important to

note that these instruments were adapted in part from the Mahan (1968) evaluation of Project Concern. Survey items bearing close resemblance in content to those used by Mahan are marked with an asterisk (*).

At various times during the design of the attitudinal component of the evaluation of Project Concern, consideration was given to comparing the student, teacher, and parent responses presented in the Mahan study of Project Concern to the results gathered in this evaluation ten years later. A decision was made not to conduct these comparisons due to the following factors which could affect the validity of such comparisons:

1. The Mahan sample of students, teachers, and administrators varied considerably from the sample studied in this evaluation of Project Concern.

2. The minor changes made in the wording of the survey items adapted from the Mahan study could significantly affect the responses gathered in this evaluation of Project Concern.

3. Changes in social and educational conditions since the time of the Mahan study could significantly affect the responses gathered in this evaluation of Project Concern.

Students comprising the Project Concern, suburban classroom peer, and Hartford student evaluation samples were administered their respective surveys on a structured interview basis. Hartford Test Specialists asked students the various questions contained in the survey instruments at the conclusion of the post-test administration of the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test in May 1976.

The suburban teacher survey was mailed during the last

week of May 1976, to the teachers of Project Concern children participating in the evaluation. Of the 165 suburban teacher surveys mailed, about 119 (72%) were returned.

Parents of children at grades 2, 4 and 6 comprising the suburban classroom peer evaluation sample were also mailed the suburban parent survey during the last week of May 1976. Of the 619 suburban parent surveys mailed, only about 182 (30%) were returned in time to be included in the analysis of the suburban parent responses. Approximately 3% of the suburban parent surveys were returned at a later date.

Treatment of the Evaluative Data

Pre- and post-test Woodcock Reading Mastery Test results were collated for each student participating in this evaluation of Project Concern. The pre- and post-test forms of a twenty-five percent random sample of students were drawn and checked for accuracy of scoring as well as the accuracy with which transformed test scores were reported. In one instance a systematic source of scoring error was detected for a particular test specialist. All tests administered by this person were identified and corrected. The other major source of error resulted in the computation of the total reading score. Rather than check the computation of each total reading score, it was decided to have this score recomputed by the computer system for all cases prior to the analysis of the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test results.

The Woodcock Reading Mastery Test results as well as the responses to the student, suburban teacher, and suburban parent

surveys were transferred to keypunch coding sheets. This data was then keypunched and verified to insure its accuracy prior to computer analysis. The methods used to analyze this data as well as the results obtained will be discussed in the subsequent chapters of this report.

It is important to note that Chapters II-V will focus on the presentation of the cognitive and affective results of this evaluation of the 1975-76 Hartford Project Concern Program. As requested by communities participating in Project Concern, no effort will be made to develop recommendation or to set future direction on the basis of the results presented. This responsibility rests with the communities cooperating in Project Concern.

CHAPTER II

ASSESSMENT OF THE COGNITIVE IMPACT OF PROJECT CONCERN AS MEASURED BY THE WOODCOCK READING MASTERY TEST

This chapter addresses the impact of Project Concern on the reading achievement of program participants in light of the questions formulated by participating communities in the development of the evaluation design.

Reading Growth of Project Concern Students

The major question delineated in the design of the cognitive component of this evaluation was as follows:

> What Woodcock Reading Mastery Test growth have Project Concern students in the suburbs exhibited?

The pre- (December, 1975) to Post-test (May, 1976) growth of Project Concern students participating in this evaluation at grades 2, 4 and 6 is summarized in Table 6. In reviewing Table 6 it is important to note that two types of scores are presented; mastery scores and grade equivalent scores. Mastery scores report achievement and achievement gain in equal interval units. One can compare quantitatively the master score gain of students across subtests or across grade levels. For example, students at grade 4 exhibited the same level of gain (5 mastery score units) on the word attack and passage comprehension subtests. Also, students at grades 4 and 6 exhibited the same level of gain (5 mastery score units) in passage comprehension. Since mastery scores are equal interval units, all statistical analyses of the Woodcock results were conducted

TABLE 6

SUMMARY OF WOODCOCK READING MASTERY TEST MASTERY AND (GRADE EQUIVALENT) MEAN SCORE RESULTS BY GRADE LEVEL FOR THE PROJECT CONCERN SAMPLE

Test	Grade 2 N=74 Pre	Post	Gain	Grade 4 N=70 Pre	Post	Gain	Grade 6 N=77 Pre	Post	Gain	Total N=221 Pre	Post	Gain***
Letter Identification**	133 (2.4)	140 (2.6)	7* (.2)	171	172	1	176	177	1	160	163	3
Word Identification	116 (2.0)	135 (2.5)	19* (.5)	161 (3.4)	167 (3.7)	6* (.3)	179 (4.4)	185 (4.9)	6* (.5)	152 (3.1)	162 (3.4)	10 (.3)
Word Attack	85 (2.1)	96 (3.0)	11* (.9)	102 (3.6)	107 (4.2)	5* (.6)	110 (4.7)	114 (5.6)	4* (.9)	99 (3.3)	106 (4.1)	7 (.8)
Word Comprehension	55 (1.9)	66 (2.3)	11* (.4)	74 (2.8)	81 (3.4)	7* (.6)	84 (3.7)	93 (5.1)	9* (1.4)	71 (2.6)	80 (3.3)	9 (.7)
Passage Comprehension	68 (1.9)	79 (2.7)	11* (.8)	89 (3.3)	94 (3.8)	5* (.5)	103 (4.9)	108 (5.5)	5* (.6)	87 (3.2)	94 (3.8)	7 (.6)
Total Reading	92 (2.2)	103 (2.7)	11* (.5)	119 (3.5)	124 (3.9)	5* (.4)	130 (4.5)	135 (5.1)	5* (.6)	114 (3.2)	121 (3.6)	7 (.4)

* Gain exhibited is significant at the .05 level.

** Grade equivalent scores are not reported above grade 2 since the letter identification subtest is not sensitive to achievement at higher grade levels.

*** The gain for the total group of students was not tested for significance.

using mastery scores.

In addition to mastery scores, the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test results are expressed in grade equivalent scores in parentheses. These grade equivalent scores are presented since they are found by some to be desirable. The problem with grade equivalent scores is that they are not expressed in equal interval units. They cannot be used to quantitatively compare gains on a particular subtest or to make comparisons of gain across subtests. For example, one cannot say that students at grades 2 and 6 have exhibited the same level of gain (9 months) on the word attack subtest. The numerical equivalence observed is an artifact of the grade equivalent score distribution and not a function of progress in the skill area being assessed. Also, one cannot say that fourth grade students exhibited the same level of gain (6 months) on the word attack and word comprehension subtests. Grade equivalent scores can only be used to make qualitative comparisons of pretest status versus posttest status on a particular subtest for a particular group. One must be cautious to use grade equivalent scores only in this context. Quantitative numerical comparisons of gain must be made using mastery scores.

Returning our focus to Table 6, the statistical significance of the pre- to post-test mastery score gain of Project Concern participants at each grade level was evaluated using correlated t-tests. From Table 6 it is evident that Concern students at each grade level exhibited statistically significant gains on each subtest of the Woodcock Reading Mastery

Test, with the exception of letter identification at grades 4 and 6. Although little gain was exhibited in the area of letter identification at grades 4 and 6, this should not create alarm since this subtest is not sensitive to achievement at higher grade levels.

The growth of Project Concern participants was also analyzed using analysis of variance techniques to assess whether systematic differences in growth existed by sex or by the number of years in the program. No differences were detected between the growth of male and female participants at grades 2, 4 or 6. Analyses of growth by number of years in the program detected significant differences in growth on only the letter identification subtest at grades 2 and 4. Students at grades 2 and 4 who had participated in Project Concern for a shorter period of time exhibited greater gains in letter identification than those who had participated in the program for a longer period of time.

Reading Growth of Project Concern Students Compared to the Growth of Suburban Classroom Peers and the Hartford Evaluation Sample

Given the reading growth exhibited by Project Concern participants, it is appropriate to move to the two subsections of the major question posed by communities participating in the program:

> Does the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test growth of Project Concern students in the suburbs differ from the growth of their suburban classroom peers?
>
> Does the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test growth of Project Concern students in the suburbs differ from those students who have remained in Hartford?

To facilitate these comparisons the pre- to post Woodcock Reading Mastery Test results for students comprising the suburban classroom peer and Hartford evaluation samples at grades 2, 4 and 6 are summarized in Tables 7 and 8. All pre- to post-test mastery score gains in Tables 7 and 8 were evaluated using correlated t-tests and found to be statistically significant with the exception of the letter identification subtest at the upper grade levels. As mentioned earlier, this lack of statistical significance is expected since the letter identification subtest is not sensitive to achievement at the upper grade levels.

In assessing the results presented in Tables 7 and 8 or in comparing these results to the growth of Project Concern participants in Table 6, two crucial points must be kept in mind. First, for reasons discussed earlier, all growth comparisons should be made using mastery scores. Secondly, one must keep in mind the different time lengths between pre- and post-testing for the various samples as follows:

1. Project Concern participants, December-May.
2. Suburban classroom peers, January-May.
3. Hartford students, February-May.

To further facilitate the comparison between the growth of Project Concern participants and (1) the growth of suburban peers and (2) the growth of Hartford students, the total growth for each group for all grades combined has been summarized in Table 9. In addition to pre-test, post-test, and gain results, an adjusted gain score is reported. For each student participating in the evaluation a record was kept of

TABLE 7

SUMMARY OF WOODCOCK READING MASTERY TEST MASTERY AND (GRADE EQUIVALENT) MEAN SCORE RESULTS BY GRADE LEVEL FOR THE SUBURBAN CLASSROOM PEER SAMPLE

Test	Grade 2 N=205			Grade 4 N=221			Grade 6 N=206			Total N=632		
	Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain***
Letter Identification**	138 (2.6)	147 (3.0)	9* (.4)	173	176	3*	179	178	-1	164	167	3
Word Identification	145 (2.8)	160 (3.3)	15* (.5)	180 (4.5)	188 (5.2)	8* (.7)	197 (6.4)	204 (7.6)	7* (1.2)	174 (4.1)	184 (4.8)	10 (.7)
Word Attack	101 (3.5)	110 (4.7)	9* (1.2)	117 (6.4)	120 (7.5)	3* (1.2)	123 (10.1)	126 (12.9)	3* (2.8)	114 (5.6)	119 (7.0)	5 (1.4)
Word Comprehension	71 (2.6)	81 (3.4)	10* (.8)	86 (3.9)	95 (5.5)	9* (1.6)	97 (6.0)	107 (9.3)	10* (3.3)	85 (3.8)	95 (5.5)	10 (1.7)
Passage Comprehension	84 (3.0)	93 (3.7)	9* (.7)	103 (4.9)	109 (5.7)	6* (.8)	115 (6.7)	121 (8.1)	6* (1.4)	101 (4.6)	108 (5.5)	7 (.9)
Total Reading	108 (2.9)	118 (3.4)	10* (.5)	132 (4.7)	138 (5.6)	6* (.9)	142 (6.6)	147 (8.2)	5* (1.6)	127 (4.2)	134 (4.9)	7 (.7)

* Gain exhibited is significant at the .05 level.

** Grade equivalent scores are not reported above grade 2 since the letter identification subtest is not sensitive to achievement at higher grade levels.

*** The gain for the total group of students was not tested for significance.

TABLE 8

SUMMARY OF WOODCOCK READING MASTERY TEST MASTERY AND (GRADE EQUIVALENT) MEAN SCORE RESULTS BY GRADE LEVEL FOR THE HARTFORD STUDENT SAMPLE

Test	Grade 2 N=78			Grade 4 N=57			Grade 6 N=82			Total N=217		
	Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain***
Letter Identification**	137 (2.5)	144 (2.8)	7* (.3)	166	169	3	177	173	-4*	160	161	1
Word Identification	119 (2.1)	130 (2.4)	11* (.3)	165 (3.6)	170 (3.8)	5* (.2)	181 (4.6)	186 (5.0)	5* (.4)	155 (3.2)	161 (3.4)	6 (.2)
Word Attack	80 (1.9)	89 (2.4)	9* (.5)	105 (3.9)	110 (4.7)	5* (.8)	110 (4.7)	117 (6.4)	7* (1.7)	98 (3.2)	105 (3.9)	7 (.7)
Word Comprehension	54 (1.8)	61 (2.1)	7* (.3)	72 (2.7)	80 (3.3)	8* (.5)	80 (3.3)	87 (4.1)	7* (.8)	69 (2.5)	76 (2.9)	7 (.4)
Passage Comprehension	68 (2.2)	74 (2.5)	6* (.3)	92 (3.6)	95 (3.9)	3* (.3)	103 (4.9)	105 (5.1)	2* (.2)	87 (3.2)	92 (3.6)	5 (.4)
Total Reading	92 (2.2)	99 (2.5)	7* (.3)	120 (3.6)	125 (4.0)	5* (.4)	130 (4.5)	134 (4.9)	4* (.4)	114 (3.2)	119 (3.5)	5 (.3)

* Gain exhibited is significant at the .05 level.

** Grade equivalent scores are not reported above grade 2 since the letter identification subtest is not sensitive to achievement at higher grade levels.

*** The gain for the total group of students was not tested for significance.

TABLE 9

SUMMARY OF THE WOODCOCK READING MASTERY TEST MASTERY AND (GRADE EQUIVALENT) MEAN SCORE RESULTS FOR GRADES 2, 4, AND 6 COMBINED FOR EACH OF THE SAMPLES STUDIED

Test	Suburban Peers N=632				Project Concern N=221				Hartford Students N=217			
	Pre	Post	Gain*	Adj. Gain**	Pre	Post	Gain*	Adj. Gain**	Pre	Post	Gain*	Adj. Gain**
Letter Identification	164	167	3	.207	160	163	3	.145	160	161	1	.118
Word Identification	174 (4.1)	184 (4.8)	10 (.7)	.586	152 (3.1)	162 (3.4)	10 (.3)	.499	155 (3.2)	161 (3.4)	6 (.2)	.555
Word Attack	114 (5.6)	119 (7.0)	5 (1.4)	.282	99 (3.3)	106 (4.1)	7 (.8)	.306	98 (3.2)	105 (3.9)	7 (.7)	.569
Word Comprehension	85 (3.8)	95 (5.5)	10 (1.7)	.564	71 (2.6)	80 (3.3)	9 (.7)	.423	69 (2.5)	76 (2.9)	7 (.4)	.585
Passage Comprehension	101 (4.6)	108 (5.5)	7 (.9)	.425	87 (3.2)	94 (3.8)	7 (.6)	.363	87 (3.2)	92 (3.6)	5 (.4)	.324
Total Reading	127 (4.2)	134 (4.9)	7 (.7)	.413	114 (3.2)	121 (3.6)	7 (.4)	.347	114 (3.2)	119 (3.5)	5 (.3)	.430

* Note that the gain reported in this column is based on different average pre-post test time periods, 5 months for Concern students, 4 months for suburban peers, 3 months for Hartford students.

** Note that the adjusted gain for a particular group is equal to gain divided by the average number of weeks between pre- and post-testing for that group.

the week during which the pre- and post-tests were administered. To compensate for the varying time lengths between pre- and post-testing, an adjusted gain score was calculated by dividing pre- and post-test gain by the number of weeks between pre- and post-testing. Adjusted gain is an index of mastery score gain per week. Since adjusted gain is corrected for the varying time lengths between pre- and post-testing and is expressed in mastery score units, one can directly compare the magnitude of the adjusted gains of Project Concern participants to the adjusted gains for the other groups being studied.

In comparing the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test adjusted gains for, say, the Project Concern and suburban peer groups in Table 9, the question arises as to whether the adjusted gains for the two groups are significantly similar or different. This question can be answered using Hotelling's T^2 technique which assesses the degree of similarity between vectors of scores for two groups. Due to the unequal numbers of students across the various groups and grade levels being studied, it was decided to make the various groups equal by sampling from the data collected in this evaluation. This way each group and grade level would have an equal weighting in the analyses being conducted.

For the comparison of the Project Concern and suburban classroom peer adjusted gain, random samples of seventy (70) students were drawn at each grade level. For the comparison of the Project Concern and Hartford student adjusted gain,

random samples of fifty-seven (57) students were drawn at each grade level. Sample means and standard deviations were checked to be sure that the various samples were representative of the populations from which they were drawn.

Once representative samples of equal sizes were created, Hotelling's T^2 was used to assess the degree of similarity between the adjusted gain of Project Concern participants and the adjusted gain of (1) suburban classroom peers, and (2) Hartford students. The results of these comparisons are summarized in Table 10. From Table 10, it is evident that based on adjusted gains there is a significant difference between the growth of the Project Concern participants and suburban classroom peers in favor of the suburban peers. This favorable difference is due to the somewhat larger growth exhibited by suburban classroom peers on the word comprehension subtest. A significant difference also exists between the growth of Project Concern participants and Hartford students in favor of the Hartford students. This difference is due to the substantially greater gain exhibited by Hartford students on the word attack subtest.

One factor which could bias the results of these analyses of student reading growth against the Concern participants is the December holiday vacation. When comparing the Concern growth to suburban peer growth, the concept of adjusted gain assumes that the three weeks between the pre-testing of Concern and the pre-testing of suburban peers was spent on providing instruction to Concern students. This assumption is

TABLE 10

COMPARISON OF THE WOODCOCK READING MASTERY TEST GROWTH OF PROJECT CONCERN PARTICIPANTS TO THE GROWTH OF SUBURBAN CLASSROOM PEERS AND THE GROWTH OF THE HARTFORD SAMPLE USING THE HOTELLING T^2 TECHNIQUE

Groups Being Compared	Data Being Compared	T^2	F	df	Subtests Contributing to the Significance of the Difference					Comments
					Letter Identification	Word Identification	Word Attack	Word Comprehension	Passage Comprehension	
Project Concern vs. Suburban Classroom Peers	Reading Gain for both groups over a comparable period of time (i.e., adjusted gain)	24.40	4.83*	5,414				X		Difference in favor of suburban peers due to the word comprehension subtest
Project Concern vs. Hartford Sample	Reading gain for both groups over a comparable period of time (i.e., adjusted gain)	23.91	4.72*	5,334			X			Difference in favor of Hartford sample due to the word attack subtest
Project Concern vs. Suburban Classroom Peers	Reading gain for both groups over a comparable period of time taking into consideration the December holiday vacation	9.66	1.91	5,414						No difference between the groups compared
Project Concern vs. Hartford Sample	Reading gain for both groups over a comparable period of time taking into consideration the December holiday vacation	16.63	3.29*	5,334			X			Difference in favor of Hartford sample due to the word attack subtest

* Significant at the .05 level.

not correct since the December holiday vacation occupied a sizeable portion of this time. Also, one cannot discount the instructional wind-down and start-up periods preceding and following such a vacation period. In conclusion, it could be argued that little or no instruction took place during these three weeks. Thus, this factor could be taken into consideration when comparing the growth of Concern participants to the other groups studied.

The potential impact of the holiday vacation on the analysis of Concern student growth was examined in two ways. First, the Woodcock raw gain of Concern participants was compared to the raw gain of suburban peers. Such an analysis assumes no difference in pre-testing times between the Concern students and suburban peers. From Table 10, it is evident that there is no difference between the growth of Concern participants and suburban peers when raw gain is used as the criterion measure of performance. Secondly, the adjusted gain of Concern participants was modified to compensate for the holiday vacation by subtracting three weeks from the pre- post-test time period. This modified Woodcock gain was then compared to the adjusted gain of the Hartford student sample. As indicated in Table 10, this modification did not affect the comparison of the Concern versus Hartford student growth. Hartford students still exhibited significantly greater Woodcock growth due to their performance on the word attack subtest.

Limitations and Cautions in Reviewing the Results Presented

The comparison of the growth of Project Concern participants

to (1) suburban classroom peers, and (2) Hartford students using the adjusted gain concept is based on the assumption that test score gain is progressively uniform throughout the school year. Such comparisons can be biased depending on the extent to which student growth is not uniform throughout the school year. For example, we assume Concern participants will exhibit greater gain from December to May than Hartford students from February to May due to the difference in the pre- post-test time intervals. A comparison between Concern and Hartford students using adjusted gains would be biased to the extent that the average weekly student gain for the December-February time period is significantly different from the average weekly gain for the February-May time period. Although test publishers are presently investigating the uniformity of gain issue, no empirical data is available at present which provides insights into whether adjusted gain comparisons between Concern participants and (1) suburban classroom peers, and (2) Hartford students are in fact biased.

The reader more sophisticated in techniques of statistical analysis may question why the unequal interval between pre- and post-testing was not controlled in the comparison of the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test gain of the groups studied using multivariate analysis of covariance. This technique was not applied for two reasons. First, sufficient time was not available during the analysis phase of this evaluation to pursue this direction. Secondly, in the application of multivariate analysis of covariance to this problem serious questions could

be raised concerning the outcomes due to the multimodal nature of the distribution of values for the pre- post-test time length variable. Despite this difficulty, it would be informative to apply the multivariate analysis of covariance technique to the data collected in this evaluation if appropriate resources were available in the future.

The unequal time interval between pre- and post-testing for the groups studied in this evaluation is further compounded by the relatively short period of time between pre- and post-testing. Rather than attempting to control such factors statistically or make cases for the validity of the results obtained over such a short time period, it would be advantageous to extend the evaluation of Project Concern into the next school year. The May 1976 post-test could be used as a pre-test and compared to post-test results gathered in April 1977 for the students comprising the evaluation sample in this study. A comparison of results over this longer period of time based on equivalent pre- post-test time intervals would yield more valid findings as to the impact of Project Concern on the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test performances of program participants.

In conclusion, one must be cautious in interpreting the results presented in Table 10. The only differences which exist for the groups being compared are on those subtests of the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test marked with an 'X'. One cannot generalize beyond this information to conclusions about the overall reading ability or cognitive growth of the groups being compared.

CHAPTER III

SUBURBAN TEACHER VIEWS OF THE PROJECT CONCERN PROGRAM

This chapter focuses on reporting the suburban teacher views of the Project Concern program based on their responses to the Suburban Teacher Questionnaire presented in the Appendix. As mentioned in Chapter I, the Suburban Teacher Questionnaire was mailed during the last week of May 1976 to the teachers of Project Concern students participating in the evaluation. Of the 165 questionnaires mailed, about 119 (72%) were returned. The results of the questionnaires returned are summarized in the subsequent sections of this chapter.

Background Information

Some background information regarding the staff responding to the Suburban Teacher Questionnaire is presented in Table 11. The average second and fourth grade teacher participating in Project Concern has a class size of about 24 students including 2 Project Concern participants. Typical second grade teachers have tended to have Project Concern participants in their classrooms for 5-6 years while fourth and sixth grade teachers have had Concern students in their classrooms for 3-4 years. The average sixth grade class is somewhat larger with 29 students, two of whom being Project Concern participants. It is important to note that the mean class sizes reported in Table 11 are inflated by about 3-4 students since some teachers involved in

TABLE 11

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS FOR STAFF RESPONDING TO THE SUBURBAN TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Background Characteristic	Grade 2 N=38		Grade 4 N=37		Grade 6 N=44	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Class Size	24.3	7.6	23.8	3.3	28.7	14.6
No. of P.C. Students in the Class	1.9	.9	1.6	.7	1.7	1.2
	Percent of Response by Grades					
No. of Years the Teacher has had P.C. Children in the Classroom						
a) 1-2 years	23		26		39	
b) 3-4 years	20		32		24	
c) 5-6 years	23		21		29	
d) 7-8 years	20		8		5	
e) 8+ years	10		13		2	
f) No response	3					

team or cluster arrangements reported the size of the total team or cluster with which they were working.

Suburban Teacher Ratings of Concern Pupil Progress

In responding to the teacher survey, suburban staff were asked to rate the progress of each Project Concern student in their classroom in the areas of reading, language arts, mathematics, and social adjustment. These ratings were based on their view of the child's own progress rather than in comparison to other students in their classroom. These ratings are summarized in Table 12. In Table 12, it is important to note that the percentages for various groups being rated do not add up to 100%. This is due to the fact that some teachers responded that they could not rate students' progress in some of the areas addressed.

Chi-square analyses of the ratings in each area indicated no significant differences across grade levels in the distribution of teacher ratings. Similar analyses of ratings by grade level across the areas being addressed indicated no difference in the distribution of teacher ratings across the academic areas of reading, language arts, and mathematics. The distribution of teacher ratings in the area of social adjustment differed significantly from the distribution of teacher ratings in the academic areas at grades 2 and 6. This difference is due to the greater tendency of these teachers to select the extreme ratings of superior or poor for student progress in the area of social adjustment.

TABLE 12

SUMMARY BY GRADE LEVEL OF SUBURBAN TEACHER RATINGS OF THE PROGRESS OF PROJECT CONCERN PARTICIPANTS

Student Progress Rating	Percent Response Grade 2	Grade 4	Grade 6
Reading			
- Superior	13	17	11
- Average	72	63	65
- Poor	8	16	9
Language Arts			
- Superior	5	14	10
- Average	77	59	63
- Poor	10	20	16
Mathematics			
- Superior	12	11	10
- Average	67	63	67
- Poor	12	19	11
Social Adjustment			
- Superior	33	30	35
- Average	48	50	52
- Poor	20	20	11

Suburban Teacher Views of the Influence of Project Concern Children on Suburban Children

Teacher responses to the survey items focusing on the influence of Concern participants on suburban classroom peers are summarized below.

> Do you feel Project Concern children have an influence upon the suburban children in your class?

	Grade 2	Grade 4	Grade 6
No	37%	29%	39%
Yes	63%	71%	57%

Chi square analysis of these responses indicated no significant differences in the pattern of teacher responses across grade levels. Teachers responding affirmatively to the item being discussed were asked to explain how Concern participants influenced suburban classroom peers. The comments of teachers were predominantly positive or mixed at each of the grade levels studied. On the positive side, one second grade teacher described the influence of Project Concern students in the following manner:

> The two boys who have been in my classes have been helpful. It has helped our children to understand how to get along with other children -- that all children can teach each other, to understand each other better, and to get along harmoniously in this world. Project Concern children have had a definitely positive influence.

A fourth grade teacher felt the positive influence of Project Concern increased when there was more than one Concern child in the classroom.

> Project Concern children bring a scope of experiences widely divergent from the suburban

> children in my class . . . intellectually, emotionally, and socially. This is most true when there are numbers of Project Concern children together. Having only one Project Concern child in a class, the influence he/she generates tends to diminish, because that child tends to act and perform as her peers act or perform.

Another teacher described the mixed effects of Project Concern pupils as follows:

> Some P.C. children have made many close friends among local children. Some have greatly impressed (suburban) pupils with their academic and/or athletic skills. Others have been somewhat negative in their influence, sometimes resentful toward classmates. Some have introduced language and behavior patterns that were unacceptable.

One sixth grade teacher commented that this mixed influence is characteristic of children in general regardless of their background.

> Like white children, influence is sometimes good and sometimes bad. From my experience, it has been both.

The overall view of teachers regarding the influence of Project Concern participants on suburban classroom peers is summarized best by the following response:

> In seven years I have seen P.C. children exhibit a very positive and beneficial attitude which was a good influence on suburban students, and I have seen just the opposite. In general I would say the influence has been 75% good to about 25% bad.

Suburban Teacher Views Regarding the Continuation of Project Concern

Teacher responses to the survey item focusing on the continuation of Project Concern are summarized below:

Do you favor the continuation of the Project Concern Program?

	Grade 2	Grade 4	Grade 6
Yes	67	66	70
No	3	5	11
Uncertain	30	29	17

From the results presented it is evident that the majority of teachers favor the continuation of Project Concern. In addition to stating their position on the continuation of Project Concern, teachers were asked to explain why they adopted their particular stance. There tended to be considerable consistency among teacher responses across the grade levels studied. As indicated by the following statements teachers favoring the continuation of Project Concern did so on the basis of the perceived cultural, social, and academic efforts of the program.

> I believe suburban - usually not minority - students need exposure to minority peers in order to understand differences as well as similarities. The social interaction is most important and after-school, extra-curricular opportunities are essential. Busing should of course be completely voluntary.

> 1. I believe in equal education for all and though there are flaws in this program, it is the best way to insure equality at the moment.
> 2. Broadens perspectives of both (our students) and Concern students.

> It provides a place and opportunity for inter-cultural learning that otherwise might not happen.

> By having young children associate with children from various backgrounds and homes I feel the prejudices formed or developed because of preconceived ideas adults have and impart to their children can be done away with. This is true for families from the city and the suburbs.

> Both groups benefit for they are both exposed to another 'way of living.' It provides an opportunity for developing 'color blindness.'
>
> The children definitely benefit, in that they receive special help in all needed academic areas, plus they are given more individualized instruction and attention.
>
> I feel it is a good learning experience for both the Project Concern children and the children from our community.
>
> This year has been an exceptionally satisfying year with 2 children who have profited greatly from our educational system. This is the first year in four that such satisfaction has been evident.

Teachers who were uncertain as to whether Project Concern should continue had some reservation about the academic impact of the program and also foresaw the potential of some negative social side effects. The following teacher statements are representative of these points of view.

> I do not believe that the students involved in a Project Concern program achieve any significant academic growth that could not be achieved in schools of their respective areas.
>
> For some students it seems to be washing well, for others it appears to be a failure. They have not progressed well academically. I feel that some wish they were back in Hartford.
>
> (I am . . .) not sure if the value of having a minority child who is far below average in academic areas as an example to white children of black people is a good one.
>
> I think it is needed by society but I am beginning to think it is hard on the students involved -- I am beginning to think it may disorient them, they don't know whether they fit here or there.

> It seems removing children from their neighborhood environments, placing (them) into another setting and then removing them from this and returning them to their home environment could be confusing to the total development of the children.
>
> Allows a number of children increased opportunities and possibly greater attention than their neighborhood school can provide - but then too, it takes them out of the general atmosphere of their community - which for a few children may be hard - because they almost live in 2 worlds.

Teachers not favoring the continuation of Project Concern felt the program was not effective either academically, socially, or as a means of racial integration. The following teacher quotes illustrate these points.

> I am not certain if this is the best for the children. They see what they don't have and possibly resent it. We cannot change the environment they have to go back to every day after school. I believe everyone deserves the best, but I'm wondering if they would do just as well academically in their neighborhood school.
>
> I do feel the children gain academically, but not much progress has been made socially. A great amount of money is spent on a few.
>
> I believe very strongly in the principle behind Project Concern. However, the particular kids in this class do not seem to want to integrate and have seemed to make an effort to antagonize many kids. I do not feel I have been able to help them academically or socially as much as I would have liked to do because they did not want to be helped.
>
> This is the only way at present Hartford and the suburban towns can achieve some degree of integration in the schools. It is a poor way. A better way would be to build moderate and low cost housing in all suburban towns.

Before concluding this discussion, it is interesting to look at the crossbreak below comparing teacher perceptions on

the program continuation oriented item with the prior item focusing on the influence of Concern students on suburban classroom peers.

		Do you favor the Continuation of Project Concern?		
		Yes	No	Uncertain
Do you feel Project Concern children have an influence upon the suburban children in your class?	Yes	46%	3%	15%
	No	21%	3%	10%

It is particularly interesting to note the large percent (21%) of teachers who felt Concern students did not influence suburban children, but would still want the program to continue.

Suburban Teacher Views of Areas Where the Project Concern Program Can be Improved

Suburban teachers were asked the open-ended question of how they felt the Project Concern program could be improved. Suggestions for improvement tended to cluster into four areas: (1) transportation, (2) parent-teacher contact, (3) selection of Concern participants, and (4) guidance. Representative suggestions from suburban teachers for improvements in each of these areas are delineated below.

1. Transportation

> There is a lack of reliable transportation for after school events, parent conferences, etc. This excludes the Project Concern students from valuable activities.
>
> I would like to see transportation given to those children who want to participate in after school activities. By giving them the opportunity to get involved in activities

after school hours, I feel they will just feel that much more a part of the school community.

Bus transportation should be timed so that Project Concern children are dismissed at the same time as the rest of the class. The earlier dismissal means that unnecessary 'attention' is called to these children, and they often miss important parts of the curriculum.

2. Parent-Teacher Contact

Children's parents should be more involved. They have not been able to come for conferences and children have missed some evening school events.

Release time for teachers to make home visits to Hartford should be provided.

Work on more effective parent/school communication techniques. Hartford parents do not feel any commitment to our community and vice versa. How about a parent exchange program?

Would like to have more contact with parents - make it possible to see them at home or in a group meeting in Hartford.

3. Selection of Concern Participants

I feel the screening and selection of those students participating in the program should be more rigid, so only those students who can and will benefit, only those willing to work, are given the opportunity to do so.

Screen students better so students with learning disabilities and/or unusual behavior or social problems aren't sent.

Children involved in the Project Concern Program should be placed into suburban classrooms only when school begins in September . . . (mentioned by two teachers).

I would not choose children totally by random selection; rather I would try to choose children with qualities that would help them to benefit from and enjoy the system, rather than 'fighting' it.

It is unfortunate that we had only one Project Concern student this year. If we're to take part in the program we should have at least a few more participants. This would eliminate the isolated feeling of coming in alone and being the only participant.

4. Guidance

. . . perhaps more guidance from a black 'guidance' person . . . (mentioned by two teachers).

. . . better testing and closer academic programming for the individual child. (mentioned by two teachers)

Communication with Project Concern and the schools seems to be a problem.

There should be closer contact with the people of Project Concern. In general, communication only occurs during a crisis. Possibly a representative at each school who sits in on faculty meetings, etc., and gets real feedback about specific children and will follow through with contacting parents, etc. Teach teachers how we should deal with prejudice and hostility toward kids and teachers - both black and white.

A final item on the Suburban Teacher Questionnaire asked for any additional comments or general reactions which the teacher had toward the Project Concern Program. Most comments provided on this item tended to be repetitive or supportive of comments made by the teachers earlier in the survey. For this reason such comments will not be reported.

A Cautionary Note on the Use of the Results Presented

In conclusion, it should be kept in mind that the results of the Suburban Teacher Questionnaire presented describe the attitudes and opinions of these teachers at the time of the

survey based on responses to specific formulations of questions. Such responses are a result of the teachers' individual understanding of the questions and their direct or vicarious experiences with the issues involved. From one questionnaire, one cannot assume how the same teachers would react to the same set of questions at a later point in time. Nor can one assume that they would react similarly to a questionnaire addressed to the same issues, but worded slightly differently. In short, then, the results presented must be tempered with a consideration of the point in time of the survey, the wording of the questions used, and the knowledge and experience of the suburban classroom teachers surveyed.

CHAPTER IV

STUDENT VIEWS AS THEY RELATE TO THE PROJECT CONCERN PROGRAM

This chapter focuses on reporting the views of Project Concern, suburban, and Hartford students as they relate to the Project Concern Program. As mentioned in Chapter I, Concern, suburban, and Hartford students comprising the evaluation samples at grades 2, 4 and 6 were administered the pupil surveys presented in the appendix on an interview basis by Hartford Test Specialists in May 1976. The student responses to these surveys are summarized in the subsequent sections of this chapter.

It is important to note that in constructing the pupil survey forms, Concern students, suburban classroom peers, and Hartford students were asked some common questions regarding their attitude toward various dimensions of school life. In addition, each group was asked some unique questions in reference to Project Concern. These unique questions will be summarized first, followed by the items common to the three groups surveyed.

Views of Project Concern Students

The student survey responses for those items unique to Project Concern students are summarized by grade level in Table 13. In reviewing Table 13, it is important to note that the percentages for the various grade levels do not add to one hundred. There are various reasons for this. The major reasons

TABLE 13

RESPONSES BY GRADE LEVEL FOR STUDENT SURVEY ITEMS UNIQUE TO PROJECT CONCERN STUDENTS

Survey Item	Responses	% Responses by Grade			Chi Square & (df)
		Gr. 2	Gr. 4	Gr. 6	
		(N=74)	(N=70)	(N=77)	
2a. Do you have any brothers or sisters?	Yes	84	94	94	8.29*
	No	11+	3	3	(2)
2b. Do they go to school?	Yes	80	89	86	3.73
	No	6	3	10	(2)
2c. Where do they go to school?	Hartford	29	32+	26-	6.07*
	Suburbs	27	21-	42+	(2)
	Suburbs & Hartford	21	32	18	
	Don't Know	3	4	1	
3. How do your brothers or sisters feel about you going to (name) school?	Like it	56	49	47	12.62*
	Don't Like it	6	11+	4	(4)
	Don't Care	12-	21	31+	
4. Do you think it would be good for your brothers or sisters to go to school in (suburb)?	Yes	56	56	54	9.10
	No	11	14	6	(4)
	Don't Know	6	6	15	

TABLE 13 (Continued)

Survey Item	Responses	% Responses by Grade Gr. 2	Gr. 4	Gr. 6	Chi Square & (df)
5. How do your friends in Hartford feel about you going to school in (suburb)?	Like it	41	36	35	4.61 (4)
	Don't Like it	11	17	23	
	Don't Care	33	38	39	
6. Do you want to continue going to school in (suburb) next year?	Yes	71	85	91	6.40* (2)
	No	11	11	3	
	Don't Know	12	1	5	
7. How do your parents feel about you going to school in (suburb) next year?	Want me to continue	79	85	92	Not Computable
	Wish I was in Hartford	6	7	0	
	Don't Care	8	1	5	

*A significant difference exists among the response of students across grade levels at the .05 level.

were that some students could not respond to some questions while others provided responses quite different from those delineated on the interview form. For example, a student with no brothers or sisters could not comment on whether it would be good for his siblings to attend school in the suburbs. Also, for the same item some students responded, "It's up to my parents." Responses of this sort could not be coded on the interview form. Chi-square statistics were calculated to assess any differences in student responses across grade levels. In situations where responses differed significantly across grade levels, plus and/or minus signs have been provided. A plus (+) indicates that the percent of students choosing a particular response is higher than would be expected on the basis of the item responses of students across grade levels. A minus (-) indicates that the percent of students choosing a particular response is lower than would be expected on the basis of the item responses of students across grade levels.

By way of introduction, the results presented in Table 13 indicate that approximately 85% of the Concern participants sampled had brothers or sisters in school. At grade 2, the siblings of Concern participants were quite evenly distributed between attendance at schools in the suburbs and Hartford. At grade 4 there was a significantly higher percent of siblings attending Hartford schools and at grade 6 attendance of siblings concentrated more in the direction of suburban schools. It is interesting to note the percent of students where siblings attend both Hartford and suburban schools.

In terms of siblings' reactions to Concern participants attendance of school in the suburbs, most participants perceived their brothers or sisters as either liking the idea or not caring. The percent of students perceiving their siblings as not caring increased with grade level. It is important to note that the highest percent of students perceiving their siblings as not liking the idea of their attending school in the suburbs was at grade 4, the same grade level where there was the highest concentration of siblings attending Hartford schools.

Most Concern participants perceived their friends in Hartford as either liking or not caring about their attending suburban schools. The percent of students who felt their friends in Hartford did not like their attending school in the suburbs increased with grade level, but not significantly.

Most Concern participants wanted to continue to attend school in the suburbs and felt their parents supported this desire. As grade level increased, the percent of students expressing this view also increased.

Suburban Peers Views of Concern Participants

The student survey responses for those items unique to suburban peers are summarized by grade level in Table 14. From Table 14, it is evident that about 90% of the suburban peers knew that there were Hartford children in their class. The majority of suburban peers felt they were friendly toward the Hartford children and the Hartford children were friendly toward them at least most of the time. This positive view of the relationship between suburban peers and Concern participants

TABLE 14

RESPONSES BY GRADE LEVEL FOR STUDENT SURVEY ITEMS UNIQUE TO SUBURBAN PEERS AS WELL AS THOSE SURVEY ITEMS UNIQUE TO HARTFORD PEERS

Survey Item	Responses	% Response by Grade Gr. 2	Gr. 4	Gr. 6	Chi Square & (df)
Items Unique to Suburban Peers		(N=205)	(N=221)	(N=206)	
8. Are there children from Hartford in your class?	Yes	87	92	91	.48
	No	6	5	4	(2)
	Don't Know	5	1	1	
9. How often are you friendly with the Hartford children in your class?	Always	29	27	34	3.70
	Most of the Time	38	44	43	(6)
	Sometime	16	19	10	
	Hardly Ever	6	4	4	
10. How often are the Hartford children in your class friendly to you?	Always	21	19	28	7.47
	Most of the Time	37	44	47	(6)
	Sometime	21	21	11	
	Hardly Ever	10	10	7	
Items Unique to Hartford Students		(N=78)	(N=57)	(N=82)	
8. If you had the chance, would you want to go to school in one of the towns outside of Hartford?	Yes	45	45	65+	12.85*
	No	38	33	23-	(4)
	Don't Know	15	21	10	

*A significant difference exists among the responses of students across grade levels at the .05 level.

held by suburban students increased slightly, but not significantly, by grade level. Sixth grade suburban students perceived their relationship with Concern participants to be slightly more friendly than second grade suburban students.

Hartford Student Views of the Project Concern Program

The student survey responses for the items unique to Hartford students are summarized by grade level in Table 14. This item focused on whether the Hartford students would want to go to school in one of the towns outside of Hartford, if this option was available. From Table 14, it is evident that about 53% of the students felt they would like to attend schools in the suburbs while about 31% would not. The remaining students were undecided. The percent of students wishing to attend suburban schools was significantly higher for sixth graders. These results are particularly interesting since the parents of each of these students said they would allow their child to participate in Project Concern if this option was available.

Views of Concern, Suburban, and Hartford Students Toward School Life

The student survey responses for those items common to Concern, suburban, and Hartford students will be discussed in this section. For the most part these items focus on students' general perceptions of school life along various dimensions. The first common item focused on how students liked going to their school. From the responses to this item as summarized in Table 15, it is evident that the majority of the students

TABLE 15

SUMMARY OF STUDENT SURVEY RESPONSES TO THE FOLLOWING ITEM FOR CONCERN, HARTFORD, AND SUBURBAN STUDENTS

Item: How do you like going to (name) school?

% Responses by Group & Grade

Responses	Concern			Hartford			Suburban		
	2	4	6	2	4	6	2	4	6
Always	45	51	40	46	41	36	37+	23	16-
Most of the Time	26	23	35	28	31	37	39+	54	58
Sometime	21	23	22	19	24	25	19	18	21
Hardly Ever	6	3	1	6	2	0	4	4	3
Chi Square		3.21			2.05			25.91*	
Df		4			4			4	

% Response by Grade & Group

Response	Grade 2			Grade 4			Grade 6		
	C	H	S	C	H	S	C	H	S
Always	45	46	37	51+	41	23-	40+	36	16-
Most of the Time	26	28	39	23-	31	54+	35	37	58
Sometime	21	19	19	23	24	18	22	25	21
Hardly Ever	6	6	4	3	2	4	1	0	3
Chi Square		5.69			29.40**			25.35**	
Df		4			4			4	

*A significant difference exists among the responses of students across grade levels at the .05 level.

**A significant difference exists among the responses of students across groups at the .05 level.

in the three groups surveyed at grades 2, 4 and 6 liked going to their school at least "most of the time." Significant differences in responses across grade levels were not detected for Concern and Hartford students. But for suburban students, second graders liked going to their school more than sixth grade students. Also, when comparing responses to this item by group it is evident that Concern students at grades 4 and 6 perceived their school experience in a significantly more positive light than their suburban classroom peers or their Hartford counterparts at the same grade levels.

Two other common items responded to by the three groups studied focused on the difficulty and quality of the students' classwork. The results of these two items are summarized in Tables 16 and 17. It is important to observe in Table 16 that the majority of Hartford students view themselves as working harder than the other students in their class, while the majority of suburban students perceive themselves as working at about the same level as other students in their class. An interesting significant trend emerges in this area for Concern pupils. At grade 2 the majority of Concern pupils perceive themselves as working harder than others in their class, but this focus decreases by grade level to the point that the majority of Concern participants at grade 6 see themselves as working at about the same level as other students in their class. Looking at this trend from another perspective, grade 2 Concern students view themselves as working harder than their suburban peers, but by grade 6 both groups perceive themselves as working

TABLE 16

SUMMARY OF STUDENT SURVEY RESPONSES TO THE FOLLOWING ITEM FOR CONCERN, HARTFORD, AND SUBURBAN STUDENTS

Item: Compared to other students in your class, how hard do you work at school?

% Response by Group & Grade

Response	Concern			Hartford			Suburban		
	2	4	6	2	4	6	2	4	6
Much Harder	33+	11	6-	22	26	31	9	4	5
A Little Harder	25	25	27	42	31	24	27	32	23
About the Same	29	44	60	20	34	42	53	59	63
A Little Less	7	18	5	15	7	1	9	5	6
Chi Square	25.28*			6.10			9.14		
Df	4			4			4		

% Response by Grade & Group

Response	Grade 2			Grade 4			Grade 6		
	C	H	S	C	H	S	C	H	S
Much Harder	33+	22	9-	11	26+	4-	6	31+	5-
A Little Harder	25	42	27	25	31	32	27	24	23
About the Same	29	20	53+	44	34	59	60	42-	63
A Little Less	7	15	9	18	7	5	5	1	6
Chi Square	36.96**			30.38**			45.15**		
Df	4			4			4		

*A significant difference exists among the responses of students across grade levels at the .05 level.

**A significant difference exists among the responses of students across groups at the .05 level.

TABLE 17

SUMMARY OF STUDENT SURVEY RESPONSES TO THE FOLLOWING ITEM FOR CONCERN, HARTFORD, AND SUBURBAN STUDENTS

Item: Compared to other students in your class, how good is your schoolwork?

% Response by Group & Grade

Response	Concern			Hartford			Suburban		
	2	4	6	2	4	6	2	4	6
Much Better	32+	21	8-	39	29	43	17+	10	4-
A Little Better	27	25	27	38	24	30	28	28	31
About Same	33	37	53	10	38+	22	43	55	53
Not Quite	4	14	9	11	7	4	9	6	9
Chi Square	15.55*			10.83*			17.74*		
Df	4			4			4		

% Response by Grade & Group

Response	Grade 2			Grade 4			Grade 6		
	C	H	S	C	H	S	C	H	S
Much Better	32	39+	17-	21	29+	10-	8	43+	4-
A Little Better	27	38	28	25	24	28	27	30	31
About Same	33	10-	43+	37	38	55	53	22-	53
Not Quite	4	11	9	14	7	6	9	4	9
Chi Square	28.40**			16.45**			82.15**		
Df	4			4			4		

*A significant difference exists among the responses of students across grade levels at the .05 level.

**A significant difference exists among the responses of students across groups at the .05 level.

at the same level.

Turning to students' perceptions of the quality of their classwork, the results presented in Table 17 indicate that the majority of Hartford students perceived their classwork as better than the work of their classroom peers. Concern and suburban students exhibited an interesting significant trend in that the dominant response for second grade students was that their work was better than the work of their classroom peers. But by the sixth grade this focus decreased to the point that the majority of sixth grade Concern and suburban students viewed their work as being of the same quality as their classroom peers.

Another area assessed by two common items on the pupil survey was students' perceptions of the amount of cooperation which took place in the classroom. One item focused on students' view of the degree of cooperation, while the other item focused on the individual student's involvement in the process. Responses to these items are summarized in Tables 18 and 19. From Tables 18 and 19, it is evident that the majority of students in the three groups assessed at grades 2, 4 and 6 perceived children in their class as helping each other with their classwork at least some of the time. Also, most students felt their classmates help them with their schoolwork at least some of the time. An interesting significant finding at grades 4 and 6 was that Concern pupils perceived themselves as receiving more help from their classmates than suburban or Hartford students.

TABLE 18

SUMMARY OF STUDENT SURVEY RESPONSES TO THE FOLLOWING ITEM FOR CONCERN, HARTFORD, AND SUBURBAN STUDENTS

Item: How often do the children in your class help each other with their classwork?

% Response by Group & Grade

Response	Concern			Hartford			Suburban		
	2	4	6	2	4	6	2	4	6
Most of the Time	45	41	45	34	38	45	34	37	26-
Sometime	39	42	38	38	34	33	37	43	45
Hardly Ever	10	10	13	14	17	16	22	17-	25
Never	3	3	1	13	9	6	5	1	2
Chi Square		.46			1.94			10.37*	
Df		4			4			4	

% Response by Grade & Group

Response	Grade 2			Grade 4			Grade 6		
	C	H	S	C	H	S	C	H	S
Most of the Time	45	34	34	41	38	37	45	45	26-
Sometime	39	38	37	42	34	43	38	33	45
Hardly Ever	10	14	22	10	17	17	13	16	25
Never	3	13	5	3	9	1	1	6	2
Chi Square		7.28			3.91			16.34**	
Df		4			4			4	

*A significant difference exists among the responses of students across grade levels at the .05 level.

**A significant difference exists among the responses of students across groups at the .05 level.

TABLE 19

SUMMARY OF STUDENT SURVEY RESPONSES TO THE FOLLOWING ITEM FOR CONCERN, HARTFORD, AND SUBURBAN STUDENTS

Item: How often do the children in your class help you with your classwork?

% Response by Group & Grade

Response	Concern			Hartford			Suburban		
	2	4	6	2	4	6	2	4	6
Most of the Time	29	31	35	25	12	18	19	14	16
Sometime	29	34	36	35	47	42	43	53	44
Hardly Ever	36	30	24	8	10	25	24	27	33
Never	3	4	4	30	29	13	12	4	4
Chi Square		2.17			4.24			6.23	
Df		4			4			4	

% Response by Grade & Group

Response	Grade 2			Grade 4			Grade 6		
	C	H	S	C	H	S	C	H	S
Most of the Time	29	25	19	31+	12	14	35+	18	16
Sometime	29	35	43	34-	47	53	36	42	44
Hardly Ever	36	8	24	30	10	27	24	25	33
Never	3	30	12	4	29	4	4	13	4
Chi Square		5.39			15.13**			12.34**	
Df		4			4			4	

*A significant difference exists among the responses of students across grade levels at the .05 level.

**A significant difference exists among the responses of students across groups at the .05 level.

The final two common items on the student survey focused on assessing how friendly student relationships were in the classroom. The responses to these items are summarized in Tables 20 and 21. The majority of students surveyed felt children in their class were friendly to them as well as to each other most of the time. Some interesting significant trends emerged for these items across the groups studied. For example, at grades 2, 4 and 6 Hartford students perceived the relationships among students in their classroom to be less friendly than Concern or suburban students. Also, Concern students at grades 2, 4 and 6 perceived their classmates as being more friendly to them than did their suburban peers.

A Cautionary Note on the Use of the Student Survey Results

In reviewing the results in this chapter it is important to be careful in interpreting the term "Hartford Students." These are the students comprising the Hartford evaluation sample drawn for this study only. They are students similar to those participating in Project Concern in that they meet the eligibility criteria for potential participation in Project Concern (see pp. 8-12). No generalization can be made from the Hartford student responses provided in this chapter to the views of the general population of students attending the Hartford Public Schools.

Also, it is important to note the precautions regarding the use of survey results stated at the conclusion of Chapter III. In summary, the student survey results must be tempered with a consideration of the point in time of the survey, the wording

TABLE 20

SUMMARY OF STUDENT SURVEY RESPONSES TO THE FOLLOWING ITEM FOR CONCERN, HARTFORD, AND SUBURBAN STUDENTS

Item: How often are the children in your class friendly to each other?

% Response by Group & Grade

Response	Concern			Hartford			Suburban		
	2	4	6	2	4	6	2	4	6
Always	32	20	29	29	16	17	20+	12	14
Most of the Time	38	51	49	23	36	40	51	58	65
Sometime	12	18	14	35	34	35	23	25	16-
Hardly Ever	12	10	6	11	12	7	5	4	3
Chi Square		5.78			8.89			12.99*	
Df		6			6			6	

% Response by Grade & Group

Response	Grade 2			Grade 4			Grade 6		
	C	H	S	C	H	S	C	H	S
Always	32	29	20	20	16	12	29+	17	14
Most of the Time	38	23-	51+	51	36-	58	49	40-	65+
Sometime	12-	35+	23	18	34+	25	14	35+	16
Hardly Ever	12	11	5-	10	12+	4	6	7	3
Chi Square		29.20**			15.85**			29.49**	
Df		6			6			6	

*A significant difference exists among the responses of students across grade levels at the .05 level.

**A significant difference exists among the responses of students across groups at the .05 level.

TABLE 21

SUMMARY OF STUDENT SURVEY RESPONSES TO THE FOLLOWING ITEM FOR CONCERN, HARTFORD, AND SUBURBAN STUDENTS

Item: How often are the children in your class friendly to you?

% Response by Group & Grade

Response	Concern			Hartford			Suburban		
	2	4	6	2	4	6	2	4	6
Always	43	38	50	35	36	37	28+	15-	20
Most of the Time	25	32	36	27	33	42	51	62	65
Sometime	25	24	12	29	22	16	17	19	11-
Hardly Ever	3	4	1	8	7	4	3	4	2
Chi Square	7.77			7.36			18.69*		
Df	4			4			4		

% Response by Grade & Group

Response	Grade 2			Grade 4			Grade 6		
	C	H	S	C	H	S	C	H	S
Always	43	35	28	38+	36+	15-	50+	37	20-
Most of the Time	25-	27-	51+	32-	33-	62+	36-	42	65+
Sometime	25	29+	17	24	22	19	12	16	11
Hardly Ever	3	8	3	4	7	4	1	4	2
Chi Square	24.25**			32.92**			31.04**		
Df	4			4			4		

*A significant difference exists among the responses of students across grade levels at the .05 level.

**A significant difference exists among the responses of students across groups at the .05 level.

of the questions used, and the knowledge and experiences of the students surveyed.

CHAPTER V

SUBURBAN PARENT VIEWS OF THE PROJECT CONCERN PROGRAM

This chapter centers upon reporting the views of suburban parents as they relate to Project Concern. As mentioned in Chapter I, parents of children at grades 2, 4 and 6 comprising the suburban peer evaluation sample were mailed the Parent Questionnaire presented in the Appendix during the last week of May 1976. Of the 619 Parent Questionnaires mailed, about 182 (30%) were returned in time to be analyzed. The suburban parent views toward Project Concern presented in these returned questionnaires are summarized in the subsequent sections of this chapter. It is important to note that 97% of the parents returning a questionnaire knew that their town was participating in Project Concern, while 91% of the parents knew that there were Concern students in their child's classroom.

Suburban Parent Perceptions of Project Concern

Responses to the survey item focusing on suburban parents' general perception of Project Concern are summarized below:

What do you think of Project Concern?

I have no opinion about the program	9%
I like the program	30%
I have mixed feelings about the program	43%
I don't like the program	18%

From the results presented it is evident that more parents liked the program than disliked the program with the dominant response falling in the mixed feelings category. Parents who liked the Concern program commented that it created a situation where inner-city and suburban students could exchange cultural ideas, communicate, form relationships, and come to better understand people of different backgrounds. One parent described the situation as follows:

> For our children it is a learning experience into ways children from the city live, their values, life styles, peer relationships. I hope for the city children, they benefit in somewhat the same way - perhaps breaking down the myths of differences between children.

Another reason suburban parents liked Project Concern was because they felt it provided Hartford children with better educational opportunities than could be had in the inner city.

Comments of suburban parents who did not like the Concern program clustered in several areas. Some parents disliked Project Concern because it was perceived as harmful to suburban students in two ways. First, the program meant larger classes and less teacher time for suburban children. Secondly, the discipline problems created by Concern participants as well as the language used and stories conveyed by these students were perceived as potentially emotionally harmful to suburban students. Also, some parents not liking the Project felt it created an unnatural "synthetic environment" described by one parent as follows:

> A synthetic environment is created which benefits no one! The bused child is given

> a glimpse of suburbia after a long bus ride and undoubtedly feels animosity. Judging by my children's reactions and that of their friends, if better education is desired for core city youth, funnel the funds used in busing to improve their school system.

Other parents commented that they did not like the Concern program because it violated the neighbor school concept and prevented the segregation of socio-economic classes.

Parents with mixed feelings about the Project Concern program provided a wide range of comments which are summarized as follows:

1. Busing meant the Project Concern child had to live in two worlds with two sets of friends. This could be difficult for the child to manage.

2. The buses were a problem. They were not on time nor did schedules provide the flexibility for Hartford students to participate in after-school activities.

3. Some Project Concern students created discipline problems while some others formed cliques. Both situations were viewed as Hartford students' expression of dissatisfaction with their suburban school experience.

4. Some parents were wary of the street language used by Concern students as well as the stories they conveyed of experiences in Hartford.

5. Some parents viewed busing as only a token effort at providing equal educational opportunity for Hartford students. Why not upgrade city schools to give more inner-city children a better education at home and attack the integration or segregation problems through other measures?

6. Some parents questioned whether it was educationally sound to add more students

to suburban classrooms during a time when local school budgets were being cut.

7. Some parents had mixed feelings regarding the program due to the selection criteria being used. Some felt the better Hartford children were being sent to the suburbs while others viewed the program as a vehicle for sending Hartford's problem students to the suburbs.

8. Finally, some parents had mixed feelings toward Project Concern depending on where the real financial burden for the program's operation rested.

Suburban Parent Views of the Personal Relationships Between Suburban and Project Concern Children

Three items on the parent survey focus on the personal relationships between suburban students and Project Concern participants. The parent responses to one of these items are summarized below.

How often does your child mention the Hartford Project Concern children at his school?

Often	11%
Sometime	68%
Never	21%

From these results, it is evident that the majority of suburban students made reference to the Concern pupils at least sometime, while a sizable portion (21%) make no reference to Hartford students during conversations with their parents. When asked about the types of comments their children made in reference to Concern participants, comments varied. Some parents (18%) made positive comments citing the friendly relations their child had with the Concern children. Other parents (26%) provided negative

comments indicating their child did not get along with the Concern children due to the discipline problems they created. Many parents (56%) provided positive and negative or neutral comments and clarified their statements by indicating that such comments were not unique to Hartford children since on occasion their child made similar references to their relations with their suburban peers.

One parent described the situation this way:

> Most often I don't realize the home comment is singling out a Project Concern child because it is the same comment I might hear about a (town) child.

Another item on the Parent Questionnaire focused on whether parents perceived their child as having a close friendship with the Concern children. The parent responses to this item are summarized below.

Is your child close friends with any Hartford Project Concern children?

Yes	24%
No	59%
I don't know	17%

These results indicate that the majority of the suburban parents perceived their children as not having a close friendship with Hartford Project Concern children. This perception is interesting in light of the fact that almost 70% of the suburban students commented that they were friendly toward the Hartford students in their class at least most of the time (see Table 14, p. 52).

The final item addressing the relationship between suburban

peers and Concern participants asked parents whether any Hartford Project Concern students visited their home. The parent responses to this item are summarized below:

Have any of the Hartford Project Concern students visited your home?

No	80%
Yes	20%

The results presented indicate that for the most part Concern students do not visit the homes of their suburban peers. In situations where Concern students did visit suburban homes, the reasons for the visit were the same as for visits among suburban students (i.e., to play, listen to records, birthday party, etc.) with one exception. In some instances Concern students would "stay over" or visit with a suburban peer since transportation was not readily available for the child to return to Hartford following an after school activity.

Suburban Parent Views Regarding the Continuation of Project Concern

The views of suburban parents regarding the continuation of the Project Concern Program are summarized below:

Would you like to see the Hartford Project Concern Program continue to operate in your town?

I have no opinion	8%
Yes	45%
No	21%
I am uncertain	26%

The results presented indicate that the dominant position of suburban parents was that Project Concern should continue. It

is interesting to compare the responses of parents to this item to parents perceptions of the Project Concern Program (pp. 65-68). For the most part, the following trends emerged:

1. Parents who had no opinion about the program had no opinion about its continuation.
2. Parents who liked the program favored its continuation.
3. Parents who disliked the program advocated its discontinuation.
4. Most parents with mixed feelings about the program were uncertain about its continuation.
5. Some parents with mixed feelings were optimistic about the program's effects to the extent that they favored the continuation of Project Concern, while others were pessimistic toward the effects of the program to the extent that they favored its discontinuation.

In analyzing suburban parent comments regarding the continuation of Project Concern, it was clear that parents who favored continuation cited the same reasons as those who liked the program. The same trend held between those parents favoring discontinuation and those not liking the program as well as between those parents who were uncertain about the continuation of Project Concern and those parents with mixed feelings about the program. Due to these close similarities, a discussion of parent comments regarding the continuation of Project Concern would be redundant. The reader interested in these comments can refer to the earlier section of this chapter focusing on "Suburban Parent Perception of Project Concern" (pp. 65-68).

Limitations of the Reported Perceptions of Suburban Parents Toward Project Concern

In reviewing the reported perceptions of suburban parents toward Project Concern, it is important to note the precautions regarding the use of survey results stated at the conclusion of Chapter III. In summary, the parent survey results must be tempered with a consideration of the point in time of the survey, the wording of the questions used, and the knowledge and experience of the parents surveyed. Furthermore, the 30% return rate for the Parent Questionnaire sheds some question on the generalizability of the results obtained. Given this return rate, one cannot be certain as to whether the results presented are representative of (1) the suburban parent population surveyed, or (2) that portion of the suburban parent population which due to some strong convictions wished to make its position known.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

A summary of the cognitive and affective results of the 1975-76 Hartford Project Concern Program Evaluation is presented in this chapter. The purpose of this summary is to collate for the reader some of the major findings of this evaluation. It is important to note that perceptions of the Project Concern program should not be formed on the basis of this summary alone. All findings must be interpreted in light of the evaluation design utilized, a more complete discussion of the results presented, and the limitations placed on the findings obtained. Such information is presented in Chapters I-V of this report.

Cognitive Impact of Project Concern

- Project Concern students at grades 2, 4 and 6, exhibited significant reading growth as measured by the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test.

- Suburban classroom peers at grades 2, 4 and 6, exhibited significant reading growth as measured by the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test.

- Hartford students at grades 2, 4 and 6, exhibited significant reading growth as measured by the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test.

- Project Concern student growth as measured by the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test did not vary significantly by sex or by the number of years the students participated in the program.

- Suburban classroom peers exhibited greater growth on the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test than Project Concern students due to their growth on the Word Comprehension Subtest.

- Students comprising the Hartford comparison group exhibited greater growth on the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test than Project Concern students due to their growth on the Word Attack Subtest.

- When adjusted for the December holiday vacation there is no difference between the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test growth of Project Concern students and suburban classroom peers.

Suburban Teacher Views of the Project Concern Program

- For the most part, the majority of suburban teachers at grades 2, 4 and 6 perceived Concern participants as exhibiting average progress in the areas of reading, language arts, mathematics, and social adjustment.

- Most suburban teachers felt Concern participants did have an influence upon the suburban students in their classrooms. While some felt this influence was positive, others viewed this influence as having negative or mixed effects.

- Few suburban teachers felt that the Project Concern Program should be discontinued.

- Suburban teachers felt the Project Concern Program should be improved in the areas of (1) transportation, (2) parent-teacher contact, (3) participant selection, and (4) student guidance.

Student Views as they Relate to the Project Concern Program

- The majority of Project Concern students at grades 2, 4 and 6 did not feel that their siblings or Hartford peers disliked the idea that they were attending school in the suburbs.

- Most Project Concern participants wanted to continue in the program and felt this desire was supported by their parents.

- The majority of Project Concern students felt it would be a good idea for their siblings to attend school in the suburbs.

- The majority of students in the suburbs felt that Project Concern students were friendly toward them and that they were friendly toward the Concern students.

- When questioned as to whether they would like to attend school in the suburbs, the majority of students comprising the Hartford evaluation sample responded "yes" or that they were uncertain. About one-third of these students responded they would not want to attend school outside of Hartford.

- Although the majority of Project Concern, suburban, and Hartford students perceived their school experience in a positive light, Concern students at grades 4 and 6 liked going to their suburban school more than their suburban classroom peers or their Hartford counterparts.

- Most Hartford students comprising the evaluation sample perceived themselves as working harder than the other students in their class while most suburban students perceived themselves as working at about the same level. The majority of the Concern students at grade 2 perceive themselves as working harder than other students in their class, but this view decreased with grade level such that most grade 6 Concern students perceived themselves as working at the same level as others in their class.

- The majority of Hartford students perceived their work to be of a better quality than others in their classroom. Although the same view held for Concern and suburban students at grade 2, by grade 6 most students in both these groups perceived their work to be of the same quality as their classroom peers.

- Most Concern, suburban, and Hartford students felt they helped other children with their classwork and other children helped them. Concern pupils at grades 4 and 6 perceived themselves as receiving more help from their classmates than either suburban or Hartford students.

- The majority of Concern, suburban, and Hartford students felt the children in their class were friendly to them as well as to each other. Concern students at grades 2, 4 and 6 perceived their classmates as being more friendly than either suburban or Hartford students.

Suburban Parent Views of Project Concern

- The dominant view of suburban parents was that they had mixed feelings about the Project Concern Program.

- The majority of the suburban parents responded that their children (1) sometime mentioned the Concern students at their school in home conversations, (2) were not close friends with the Concern participants, and (3) did not have the Concern pupils visit with them at their home.

- The dominant feeling of suburban parents was that the Project Concern Program should continue.

APPENDIX

OF

SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

USED IN THE

EVALUATION OF PROJECT CONCERN*

*Please note that survey items marked with an asterisk(*) are those adapted from the Mahan (1968) evaluation of Project Concern.

HARTFORD PROJECT CONCERN EVALUATION

Concern Pupil Interview Form

Name_____ School_____

Teacher_____ Grade_____ Sex_____

1. *How do you like going to (name) school? Do you like it*

   ( ) Always
   ( ) Most of the time
   ( ) Some of the time, or
   ( ) Hardly ever

2. *Do you have any brothers or sisters?*

   ( ) Yes — *Do they go to school?*
   ( ) Yes — *Where?* ( ) Hartford ( ) Suburbs *Where?*_____ ( ) Don't know
   ( ) No — If no, proceed to question 4.

   ( ) No *If no, proceed to question 5.*

* 3. *How do your brothers or sisters feel about you going to (name) school? Do you feel they*

   ( ) Like it
   ( ) Don't like it, or
   ( ) Don't care where you go to school

* 4. *Do you think it would be good for your brothers or sisters to go to school in (suburb)?*

   ( ) Yes *Why?*
   ( ) No
   ( ) Don't know

* 5. *How do your friends in Hartford feel about you going to school in (suburb)? Do you feel they*

   ( ) Like it
   ( ) Don't like it, or
   ( ) Don't care where you go to school

*6. *Do you want to continue going to school in (suburb) next year?*

( ) Yes *Why?*
( ) No
( ) Don't know

*7. *How do your parents feel about you going to school in (suburb)? Do you feel they*

( ) Want you to continue going to school in (suburb)
( ) Wish you were going to school in Hartford, or
( ) Don't care where you go to school

8. *Compared to other students in your class, how hard do you work at school?*

( ) Much harder than most students
( ) A little harder than most students
( ) About the same as most students
( ) A little less than most students

9. *Compared to other students in your class, how good is your schoolwork?*

( ) Much better than most students
( ) A little better than most students
( ) About the same as most students
( ) Not quite as good as most students

10. *How often do the children in your class help each other with their classwork?*

( ) Most of the time
( ) Sometime
( ) Hardly ever
( ) Never

11. *How often are the children in your class friendly to each other?*

( ) Always
( ) Most of the time
( ) Sometime
( ) Hardly ever

12. *How often do the children in your class help you with your classwork?*

( ) Most of the time
( ) Sometime
( ) Hardly ever
( ) Never

13. *How often are the children in your class friendly to you?*

( ) Always
( ) Most of the time
( ) Sometime
( ) Hardly ever

14. *What do you like best about going to (name) school?*

15. *What do you like least about going to (name) school?*

HARTFORD PROJECT CONCERN EVALUATION

Suburban Peer Interview Form

Name_____ School_____

Teacher_____ Grade_____ Sex_____

1. *How do you like going to (name) school? Do you like it*

   ( ) Always
   ( ) Most of the time
   ( ) Some of the time, or
   ( ) Hardly ever

2. *Compared to other students in your class, how hard do you work at school?*

   ( ) Much harder than most students
   ( ) A little harder than most students
   ( ) About the same as most students
   ( ) A little less than most students

3. *Compared to other students in your class, how good is your schoolwork?*

   ( ) Much better than most students
   ( ) A little better than most students
   ( ) About the same as most students
   ( ) Not quite as good as most students

4. *How often do the children in your class help each other with their classwork?*

   ( ) Most of the time
   ( ) Sometime
   ( ) Hardly ever
   ( ) Never

5. *How often are the children in your class friendly to each other?*

   ( ) Always
   ( ) Most of the time
   ( ) Sometime
   ( ) Hardly ever

6. *How often do the children in your class help you with your classwork?*

   ( ) Most of the time
   ( ) Sometime
   ( ) Hardly ever
   ( ) Never

7. *How often are the children in your class friendly to you?*

( ) Always
( ) Most of the time
( ) Sometime
( ) Hardly ever

8. *Are there children from Hartford in your class?*

( ) Yes
( ) No *If no or don't know, proceed to item 11.*
( ) Don't know

9. *How often are you friendly with the Hartford children in your class?*

( ) Always
( ) Most of the time
( ) Sometime
( ) Hardly ever

10. *How often are the Hartford children in your class friendly to you?*

( ) Always
( ) Most of the time
( ) Sometime
( ) Hardly ever

11. *What do you like best about going to (name) school?*

12. *What do you like least about going to (name) school?*

HARTFORD PROJECT CONCERN EVALUATION

Hartford Student Interview Form

Name_____ School_____

Teacher_____ Grade_____ Sex_____

1. *How do you like going to (name) school? Do you like it*

( ) Always
( ) Most of the time
( ) Some of the time, or
( ) Hardly ever

2. *Compared to other students in your class, how hard do you work at school?*

( ) Much harder than most students
( ) A little harder than most students
( ) About the same as most students
( ) A little less than most students

3. *Compared to other students in your class, how good is your schoolwork?*

( ) Much better than most students
( ) A little better than most students
( ) About the same as most students
( ) Not quite as good as most students

4. *How often do the children in your class help each other with their classwork?*

( ) Most of the time
( ) Sometime
( ) Hardly ever
( ) Never

5. *How often are the children in your class friendly to each other?*

( ) Always
( ) Most of the time
( ) Sometime
( ) Hardly ever

6. *How often do the children in your class help you with your classwork?*

( ) Most of the time
( ) Sometime
( ) Hardly ever
( ) Never

7. *How often are the children in your class friendly to you?*

( ) Always
( ) Most of the time
( ) Sometime
( ) Hardly ever

8. *If you had the chance, would you want to go to school in one of the towns outside of Hartford?*

( ) Yes *Why?*
( ) No
( ) Don't know

9. *What do you like best about going to (name) school?*

10. *What do you like least about going to (name) school?*

Capitol Region Education Council
800 Cottage Grove Road, Bldg 2
Bloomfield, Connecticut 06002

Area Code 203 243-8923

May 27, 1976

To: Teachers in Suburban Hartford School Districts

From: Edward F. Iwanicki
Project Concern Program Evaluation Consultant

Re: Project Concern Evaluation
Suburban Teacher Questionnaire

During this school year, the Capitol Region Education Council is conducting an evaluation of the Hartford Project Concern Program. This evaluation is being conducted in cooperation with the Connecticut State Department of Education and the Superintendents of suburban school districts participating in Project Concern. Such an evaluation effort would not be complete without input from teachers closely involved in this program. As a teacher with Project Concern students in your classroom, you are being asked to complete the brief questionnaire attached.

In completing this questionnaire, some items can be answered by simply checking (√) the appropriate reasponse, while other items ask for your comments. Please be as frank and honest as possible. The views of teachers are quite valuable in evaluating Project Concern. The feedback obtained from teachers will be summarized for all suburban communities and presented in the final evaluation report. At no time will individual responses be identified by teacher or community name. Please complete this questionnaire and mail it in the envelope provided to the Capitol Region Education Council by June 10, 1976.

Thank you sincerely for your cooperation. If for any reason additional questionnaires are needed, your principal has been provided with some extra copies. A report on the evaluation of the 1975-76 Hartford Project Concern Program containing a summary of teacher views will be available in September, 1976.

EFI:ckm
encls.

HARTFORD PROJECT CONCERN EVALUATION

Suburban Teacher Questionnaire

Teacher Name_____ Town_____

School_____ Grade(s) you are now teaching_____

*1. At present, how many Hartford Project Concern students do you have in your class? _____

2. What is the total number of students in your class, including Project Concern students? _____

*3. For how many years have you had Hartford Project Concern students in your classroom?

( ) 1-2 years ( ) 5-6 years
( ) 3-4 years ( ) 7-8 years
( ) more than 8 years

*4. Do you feel Project Concern children have an influence upon the suburban children in your class?

( ) No
( ) Yes If yes, explain how.

Hartford Project Concern Evaluation
Suburban Teacher Questionnaire

5. In the grid below, please rate the progress of each Project Concern student in your classroom in the areas specified. This rating should be based on your view of the child's own progress rather than in comparison to other students in your classroom. Please note that

'S' - indicates Superior progress
'A' - indicates Average progress
'P' - indicates Poor progress

For example, if student #1 exhibits average progress in reading, a check (√) would be placed in column A under the reading heading. Progress of this student in other areas would be recorded by checking the appropriate column beneath each of the other areas of language arts, math, and social adjustment.

Project Concern Students' Name	Reading			Language Arts			Math			Social Adjustment		
	S	A	P	S	A	P	S	A	P	S	A	P
1.												
2.												
3.												
4.												
5.												
6.												
7.												
8.												
9.												
10.												

Hartford Project Concern Evaluation
Suburban Teacher Questionnaire

In the space below, please provide any specific or general comments you would like to make regarding your ratings of the progress of Project Concern students in your class. Use the back of this page if additional space is needed.

Hartford Project Concern Evaluation
Suburban Teacher Questionnaire

6. Do you favor the continuation of the Project Concern Program?

( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) Uncertain

Please explain the reason for your response below:

7. How do you feel the Project Concern Program could be improved?

8. Please provide any additional comments or general reaction you may have toward the Project Concern Program.

Capitol Region Education Council
800 Cottage Grove Road, Bldg 2
Bloomfield, Connecticut 06002
Area Code 203 243-8923

May 27, 1976

To: Parents in Suburban Hartford School Districts

From: Edward F. Iwanicki
Project Concern Program Evaluation Consultant

Re: Project Concern Evaluation
Parent Questionnaire

During this school year, the Capitol Region Education Council is conducting an evaluation of the Hartford Project Concern Program in cooperation with the Connecticut State Department of Education and superintendents in participating suburban school districts. Project Concern is a program where children from Hartford attend school in your community. An important piece of information in this evaluation is how parents view the Hartford Project Concern Program. For this reason, you are being asked to complete the brief questionnaire attached.

In completing this questionnaire, please be as frank and honest as possible. You do not have to put your name on this questionnaire. The information obtained from parents will be summarized for the suburban communities participating in Project Concern in total and presented in the final evaluation report. At no time will the views of parents be identified for a specific school or community. Please complete this questionnaire and mail it in the stamped self-addressed envelope provided to the Capitol Region Education Council by June 17, 1976.

Thank you sincerely for your time and cooperation. A report on the evaluation of the 1975-76 Hartford Project Concern Program containing a summary of parent views will be available in September, 1976.

ckm
encls.

PROJECT CONCERN EVALUATION

Parent Questionnaire

In what town do you live?_____ What school does your child attend?_____

Directions: For each of the questions below, please check (✓) the one response which best represents your knowledge and opinions about Project Concern. For those questions where you are asked to explain why you chose a particular response, please provide as much information as possible. Parent comments in these areas will be very helpful in making decisions about Project Concern.

1. Before receiving this questionnaire, did you know that your town has been participating in Project Concern?

   ( ) Yes
   ( ) No

*2. What do you think of Project Concern?

   ( ) I have no opinion about the program
   ( ) I like the program
   ( ) I have mixed feelings about the program
   ( ) I don't like the program

   In the space below, please explain why you feel this way.

3. Does your child have any Hartford Project Concern students in his/her class?

   ( ) Yes
   ( ) No
   ( ) I don't know

Project Concern Evaluation
Parent Questionnaire

*4. How often does your child mention the Hartford Project Concern children at his school?

( ) Often
( ) Sometime
( ) Never

If you child mentions the Project Concern children, what types of comments does he/she make about them?

*5. Have any of the Hartford Project Concern students visited your home?

( ) No
( ) Yes

If they have visited, please comment on the purpose(s) of their visit(s) below.

*6. Is your child close friends with any Hartford Project Concern children?

( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) I don't know

Project Concern Evaluation
Parent Questionnaire

*7. Would you like to see the Hartford Project Concern Program continue to operate in your town?

( ) I have no opinion
( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) I am uncertain

In the space below, please explain why you feel this way.

Thank you very much for completing this questionnaire. If you have any other views about Project Concern, please feel free to mention them below.